IMPEACHMENT

CONTINUED FROM THIRD PAGE.

ere. What is the ground on which they seek to rove anything in relation to Mr. Cooper? They say hey expect to prove that Mr. Cooper was put into be office of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury be he President in order to control the disbursements of money in that department. Now, if it were necesary to have an article charging the President with he appointment of General Thomas as a means used by him to get control of the public moneys, of course would be equally necessary to have an article counted on the same line of conduct in regard to Mr. Jooper.

Gounded on the same line of conduct in regard to Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Bingham said—Mr. President, we consider the law to be well seitled and accepted everywhere in this country and in England that every independent act on the part of the accused looking to the subject matter of inquiry may be given in evidence, and we go no further than that. We undertake to say, on very high and commanding authority, that it is settled that such other and independent acts showing the purpose of the accused to bring about the same general results, although they may be the subject matter of a separate indictment, may, nevertheless, be given in evidence. If a person is charged with having counterfeit notes in his possession of a certain denomination it is competent to show that he was in possession of other counterfeit notes of a different denomination, and the rule of the books is that whatever is competent to prove the general charge is competent to prove the general charge is competent to prove the ment. What is the allegation in the eleventh article? That the President, for the purpose of setting aside and defenting this law—

Mr. Syanbery—What law?

Mr. BINGHAM—The Tenure of Office act. Resumming:—I undertake to say that by the existing law the appropriation made for the support of the army can only be reached in the Treasury through a requisition drawn by the Secretary of War. There is an independent act done by the accused for the purpose of adding this result. How? By appointing an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who, under the law and regulations, is authorized to sign warrants that may be drawn on the Treasury, who, under the law and regulations, is authorized to sign warrants that may be drawn on the Treasury, who, concern the law and regulations, is authorized to sign warrants that may be drawn on the Treasury through a requisition draw by the sense it has nothing to do with the simple inquiry "who, course it has a great deal to do with the matter. If the question is to make the matter, if the question. I am prehend

BUTLER said he would insert a date satisfac Mr. BUTLER said he would insert a date satisfactory to himself. He then modified his proposition so as to read, "We offer to prove that after the President determined on the removal of Mr. Stanton from the office of Secretary of War, in spite of the action of the Senate, there being no vacancy in the office of Assistant Secretary of the Treasmy," &c.

Mr. Evarrs suggested that that did not indicate the date sufficiently.

Mr. BUTLER—I think, if the learned gentlemen will allow me, I will make my offer as I like it myself. (Laughter.).

Mr. EVARTS—Of course; I only ask you to name a date.

Mr. BUTLER repeated the offer.

The CHIEF JUSTICE asked the counsel for the President if they desired to be heard in support of the

bjection.

Mr. Evarrs replied no; we simply object. It ought not to need any argument.

The Cruze Justice said he would submit the question to the Senate whether the testimony ought to be submitted.

The CHIEF JUSTICE said he would submit the question to the Senate whether the testimony ought to be submitted.

Senator Sherman requested the Managers to read the particular clauses of the eighth and eleventh articles, to prove which the testimony is offered.

Mr. BUTLER replied by reading that part of the eighth article which charges the President with inzent unlawfully to control the disbursement of money appropriated for the military service and for the Repartment of War; and also by reading that part of the eleventh article which charges the President with unlawfully devising and contriving, and attempting to devise and contrive means then and there to prevent the execution of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the army." He also read that part of the eleventh article which charges the President with unlawfully devising and contriving, and attempting to devise and contrive means by which he should prevent Edwin M. Standon from forthwith resuming the functions of the office of Secretary for the Department of War, notwithstanding the refusal of the Senate to concur in the suspension theretofore made. He said that in that connection the Managers claimed that the appointment of Mr. Cooper was part of the machinery to carry out the design of the President. The question was, he said, whether Mr. McCulloch would answer to requisitions of General Thomas, or of anybody else whom the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not do so; therefore the President knew he would not

his control, and it was with that highly that he made the appointment of Cooper. See Senator JOHNSON Dut the following question to the Managers in writing:—"The Managers are requested to say whether they propose to show that Cooper was appointed by the President in November, 1887, as a means to obtain the unlawful possession of the public money other than by the appointment itself." Mr. BUTLER—We certainly do. We propose to show that he appointed him, and that thereupon Cooper went into the exercise of the duties of the office before his appointment could by any possibility be legal. We hope and believe that we show that he has been controlling other public moneys since.

since.

Senator Henderson requested that the testimony
of witness, in reference to the mode and manner of
outliness on the secretary of
War should be read.

War should be read.

The Chief Justice remarked that the witness might be asked to repeat his statement.
Senator Hundenson said that his object was to know whether money could be obtained on the signature of the Assistant Secretary instead of the Secretary. eretary. Mr. BUTLER proceeded to examine the witness on

that point.
Q. State whether the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury can sign warrants for the payment of

Q. State whether the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury can sign warrants for the payment of money?

Mr. Evarts—That is not the question.

Mr. Bether to witness—State whether on the requisition of any department of the government the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury can sign warrants on the Treasury for payment of money?

Witness—Until the passage of the late statute, whenever the Secretary of the Treasury was present and acting money could not be drawn from the Treasury on the signature of the Assistant Secretary. An act has been passed within a year allowing the Assistant Secretary to sign warrants for the payment of money into the Treasury covering in warrants and warrants for the payment of money of accounts stated; but the practice still centinues of honoring all customary warrants by the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury; the warrants are prepared and the initials of the Assistant Secretary are put upon them, and they are signed by the Secretary of the Treasury when they are presented.

ented.
Senator Fessenden asked that the law to which Senator Fessender asked that the law to which witness referred hight be read.

While the messenger was gone for the statutes the Chief Justice and he would ask the witness whether before the passage of the not to which he referred any warrant could be drawn by the Assistant Secretary unless he was acting secretary in the absence of the Secretary?

Witness—There could not. No money can be drawn from the Treasury on the signature of the Assistant Secretary unless when he is acting as Secretary.

Mr. BULLAR—When the Assistant Secretary acts for the Secretary does be sign all warrants for the payment of money?

Witness—When he is Acting Secretary of course he signs all warrants for the payment of money.

signs all warrants for the payment of money. Senator CAMERON said he desired to ask the wit-

mess a question.

The Chity Justice reminded the Senator that the

ness a question.

The CHYP JUSTICE reminded the Senator that the rules required questions by Senators to be reduced to writing.

While Senator Cameron was writing out his question Mr. BUTLER read the act referred to by Mr. Chandler. The act declares that the Secretary of the Treasury shall have power, by appointment, to delegate to one Assistant Secretary to sign in his stead all warrants for the payment of money into the public Treasury and all warrants for the disbursement of public money certified to be due on acts duly audited and settled, and all warrants skieded are to have the same validity as if signed by the Secretary insect.

Mr. Evalits—What is the date of this law?

Mr. BUTLER—March 2, 1867. To witness—In case of the removal or absence of the Secretary perform all the acts of the Secretary? A. That is the law.

Q. I was only asking about the practice. Is that the practice? A. I am not certain that it is without in an appointment as Acting Secretary, signed by the Senator Cameron sent up his question in writing.

Senator Cameron sent up his question in writing, as follows:—"Can the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, under law, draw warrants for payment of money by the Treasury?"

Witness—since the passage of the act I understand that the Assistant Secretary can sign warrants for the payment of money in the cases specified, which is presumed, however, to be with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Senator Cameron declined to ask the witness applier and Son without reducting to writing.

it has been.

Senator FESSENDEN submitted the following question in writing:—"Has it been the practice, since the passage of this law, for an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to sign warrants unless he was specially appointed and authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury? Has any Assistant Secretary been authorized to sign any warrants secretary been are specified in the act?"

Witness—It has not been the practice of an Assistant Secretary, since the passage of the act, to sign warrants unless on appointment by the Secretary for that purpose, in accordance with the provisions of the act. Immediately on the passage of the act the Secretary authorized one of his Assistant Secretaries to sign warrants of the character described in the act, and they have been customarily signed by that Assistant Secretary been authorized to sign any warrants except such as are specified in the act? A. No Assistant Secretary has peen authorized to sign warrants except such as are specified in that act unless he is Acting Secretary.

The Chilef Justice put the question as to whether the proof proposed by Mr. Butler should be admitted.

The vote was taken and resulted—yeas 22, nays

The vote was taken and resulted—yeas 22, nays 27—as follows:—

27—as follows:—
YEAS—Measra Anthony, Cameron, Cattell, Chandler, Cole, Conking, Corbett, Cragio, Drake, Howard, Howe, Morgan, Morrill of Vt., Nye, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Ross, Syrague, Suner, Thayer, Tipton and Wison—22.
Nave.—Measra Bayard, Buckalew, Conness, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Edmunds, Ferry, Fessenden, Fowler, Freilinghuysen, Grimes, Henderson, Hendricks, Johnson, McCreery, Morrill of Mc., Morton, Patterson of M. H., Patterson of Tenn., Sherman, Siewart, Trumbull, Van Winkle, Vickers, Willey and William—27.

So the testimony was not permitted to be offered.
TESTIMONY OF CHARLES A. TINKER.
Charles A. Tinker sworn and examined by Mr.

BOUTWELL:—
Q. What is your business? A. Telegrapher.
Q. Are you in charge of any office? A. I am in charge of the Western Union Telegraph office in this charge of the Western Union Telegraph office in this city.

Q. Were you at any time in charge of the Military Telegraph Office in the War Department? A. I was.

Q. From what time and to what time? A. I can hardly tell you from what time; I was in charge of it up to August, 1867; I think I was in charge of it up to August, 1867; I think I was in charge of it something like a year; I was connected with the office something like five years.

Q. While in charge of this office state whether a despatch from Lewis E. Parsons, of Monigomery, Ala., came to "Andrew Johnson, President," and if so, at what date. A. I think while I was in that office I saw a good many such despatches.

Q. What paper have you now in your hand? A. I have what professes to be the copy of a telegram from Lewis E. Parsons, of Monigomery, Ala., addressed "To his Excellency Andrew Johnson, President."

dent."

Q. Do you know whether that telegram came through the office? A. I recognize this as being the character of a despatch which was received at the Military Telegraph Office.

Q. Were the duplicates of telegraphs received kept at the Military Telegraph Office? A. What is called a "press copy" is taken of every despatch before delivered.

a "press copy" is taken of every despatch before delivered.

Q. Is a copy taken of every despatch before sent?

A. Not before being sent; the originals we keep on file at the office.

Q. State whether at my request you examined these press copies. A. I did.

Q. Did you find such a despatch as I have described among these press copies? A. Did.

Q. Did you gopy it? A. I made a copy of it.

Q. Have you got one on hand? A. No, I have not; I made a copy of the despatch and answered the summons of the Managers. I placed the copy in your hands, and I heard you order the cierk to make a copy afterwards. The cierk returned with this copy, and you gave me back the copy I had made. This is the copy which the cierk made.

Q. Have you the original despatch? A. I have, Mr. BUTLER—Produce the original despatch and copy, both.

copy, both.

Mr. Evarts—What is meant by the original de-

spatch?
Witness—I mean that I have the press copy.
Mr. Stanbery (to the witness)—bid you make this press copy yourself? A. The press copy is made by a cierk.
Mr. Evarts objected to putting in evidence the acterk.

Mr. Evarts objected to putting in evidence the copy from the press book.

Mr. Butler said he would pass from that for one moment and would ask the witness this question—Do you recollect whether such a telegram as this passed through the officer.

Q. State whether on the same day you had an original despatch signed Andrew Johnson? A. I have the despatch on tile.

Q. Are you so familiar with the signature of Andrew Johnson as to tell whether that is his signature or not? A. I believe it to be his signature; I am very familiar with it.

Q. Have you any doubt of it within your own mind? A. None whatever.

Q. Is that book which you hold in your hand the record book of the United States Military Telegraph in the Executive Office wherein original despatches are put on record? A. It is the book in which original despatches are filed.

Q. Do you know whether this despatch to Lewis E. Parsons passed through the office? A, I do know it from the marks contained; it bears marks as having been sen!.

Mr. Stanbery—Let us see the despatch.

Mr. Butler was handing the book to Mr. Stanbery when he suddenly remarked, "I will give you a copy of it." (Laughier.) He subsequently, however, handed the book to Mr. Stanbery.

Mr. Stanbery inquired what was the object of the proof?

Mr. Butler—Do you object to the document what-

Mr. Stanbert inquired what was the object of the proof?
Mr. Butler—Do you object to the document whatever is the object of the proof?
Mr. Stanbert—We want to know what it is.
Mr. Butler—The question which I disk is whether you object to the vehicle of proof?
Mr. Stanbert—Oh, no.
Mr. Butler do witness—What is the date of that

despaich? A. January 17, 1867. Mr. STANBERY (to Mr. Butler)-Now, what is the Mr. BUTLER-Not yet, sir. (To the witness)-On

Mr. Stansher (to Mr. Bullet)—Now, what is the object of fir?

Mr. Butler—Not yet, sir. (To the witness)—On the same day that this is dated do you find in the records of the department a press copy of a despatch from Lewis E. Parsons to which this is an answer? A, I find the press of a despatch to which that was an answer.

Q. Was this telegraph office under the control of the War Department and in the War Department building? A. It was.

Q. The officers were employes of the War Department? A. They were.

Q. Were the records kept at that time in the War Department? A. They were.

Q. And are those books and papers produced from the War Department? A. No, sir, they are not.

Q. Where do they come from now? A. They came from the War Department? to the telegraph office.

Mr. Butler said now he proposed to give in evidence the despatch of Lewis C. Parsons, to which Andrew Johnson made reply, and asked if there were any objection to it as a venicle of proof, not as to the completeness of the testmony.

Mr. Evarrs said—On that point, in the present case, although we regard the proof of Mr. Parsons despatences insufficient, yet we will waive any objection of that kind, and the question we now stand upon is as to the competency of the proof. We have had no notice to produce the original despatch of Mr. Parsons, but we care nothing about that; we waive that, and now we inquire in what views and under what article these despatches dated prior to the Tenure of Office act are introduced.

Mr. Butler—In order that we may understand whether those papers are admissible in evidence it becomes necessary, with the leave of the President of the Senate, to read them de bene esse.

Mr. Curits—We do not object to your reading them de bene esse.

them de bene esse.

Mr. Butler thereupon read the despatches, as fol-

MONTGOMEEY, Ala., Jan. 17, 1887.

His Excellency Andrew Joinson, President—:
Legislature in session. Efforts made to reconsider vote or
constitutional amendment. Report from Washington says it
is protoable an enabling act will pass. We do not know what
to believe. LEWIS C. PARSONS, Exchange Hotel.

is probable an enabling set will pass. We do not know what to believe. LEWIS C. PARSONS, Exchange Hotel.

U. S. MILITARY TPLEGRAPH, EXECUTIVE OFFICE, 'WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 17, 1867.
Hon. Lywins C. Parsons, Montgomery, Ala.:—
What possible good can be obtained by reconsidering the constitutional ameedment? I know of none in the present posture of affairs. I do not believe the people of the whole country will sustain any set of individuals in the attempt to change the whole character of our government by enabling acts in this way. I believe, on the contrary, that they will eventually uplands all who have patriotism and courage to stand by the constitution and who place their confidence in the people. There should be no faltering on the part of those who are hotest in the determination to sustain the several coordinate departments of the government in accordance with its original design.

Mr. BUTLER said be did not desire to argue the question as to the admissibility of the evidence; he claimed that it was compétent either under the tenth or eleventh articles.

Mr. CURITE—The tenth article set out speeches, not telegrams.

Mr. BUTLER - A mr. populated by the learned.

or eleventh articles.

Mr. Curis—The tenth article set out speeches, not telegrams.

Mr. Burten—I am reminded by the learned counsel that these are speeches, not telegrams, that the tenth article refers to. I know they are; but with what intent were these speeches made? For what purpose were they made? They were made for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy against Congress and at awful acts, and to bring Congress into ridicule and contempt. But now I am on the point where an altempt is made to array the people against the lawful acts of Congress; to destroy the regard and respect of all good people for Congress, and to excite the odum and resentment of all the good people of the United States against Congress and a law which it enacted. The President went through the country in September, 1866, deciaring that Congress had no power to do what it was preposing to de. Congress had proposed the constitutional amendment to the people of the States, and for the purpose of preventing that constitutional amendment being accepted every possible contumely was thrown at Congress and every possible contumely was thrown at Congress and every possible contumely was thrown at Congress and every possible to the test of the tribute of the states, the President of the United States stepping down from his high position and telegrampling to the Legislature of Alabama no to accept the proposal amendment. I do not care to argue the question further.

Mr. Evarrs—If the honorable Managers are right this amendment is proposed to be relevant and competent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and constitutional in the context of the third and consequent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and consequent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and consequent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and consequent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and the consequent only in reference to the crimes charged in the leath and the consequent only in reference to

Mr. Evars—You did not name any of the others.
Mr. Butler—I did not think it necessary.
Mr. Evars—Then I shall not think it necessary to onsider the other. The article here charges that it President of the United States devised and included to account the property of the control of the United States. resentment of all good people against courress and the aws consistutionally enacted by them. Now the acts charged to be done by the President and the text of the control o

The despatenes were again read.

Cries of "question!"

Mr. BUTLER—Let me first call attention to the fifth section of the act of March 2, 1867, known as the Reconstruction act:—"And when said State, by a vote of its Legislature elected under said constitution, shall have adopted the amendment of the constitution of the United States proposed by the Thirtymint Congress, and known as a ricle fourteen, and when said article shall become part of the constitution of the United States, the said State shall be entired to representation in Congress, and Senators and Representation in Congress, and Senators and Representation of the admitted therefrom on their taking the oath prescribed by law." So that the adoption of the amendment is a part of the Reconstruction act.

the adoption of the amendment is a part of the Reconstruction at Cries of "Question!"
Mr. Howard—Mr. President of a question.
It was read, as follows:
"What amendment of the constitution is referred to in Mr. Parson's despatch!"
Mr. BUTLER There was but one at that time before the country; that was known as the fourteenth article, and is the one I have just read, and which is required to be adopted by every State Legislature before the State can be admitted to representation in Congress.

Congress.
Cries of "Question!" "Question!"
The CHIEF JUSTICE again stated the question to be whether the evidence offered by the Managers is ad-

whether the evidence observed by the Managers is admissible.

Senator Drake called for the yeas and nays.

In seconding the call several Senators held up their hands, but their Hunger Justice Said:—"The Senators will rise."

The call was ordered, and resulted yeas 27, nays

The call was ordered, and the first state of the color, NAYS Messrs. Buckalew, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Ed-munds, Ferry, Fessenden, Fowler, Frelinghuysen, Mctreery, Morrill of Me., Norton, Patterson of Tenn, Trumbull, Van Winkle, Vickers, Williams—17.

Winkle, Vickers, Williams—17.
So the evidence was admitted.
Mr. Doolittle moved the court do now adjourn until to-morrow at twelve o'clock.
Mr. SUMNER—I hope not.
The CHIEF JUSTICE put the question and declared it host.

The CHIEF JUSTICE put the question and declared it lost.

Several Senators called for a division.

Mr. RAMSEY—The question was not understood.

The CHIEF JUSTICE put the question again and said the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. Stunken asked for the yeas and nays, which were called, with the following result:—

YEAS—Measis. Anthony. Buckslew. Cameron, Corbett, Cragin, Davis, Diron, Doolittle, Fowler, Fredhahuysen, Henderson, McCreery, Morrill of Vt., Norton, Fatterson of Tenn., Ramsey, Sprague. Tipton, Trumbuli, Van Winkle, Vickers and Wilbey—22.

NAYS—Measis. Cattell, Chandler, Cole, Conness, Conkling, Drake, Edmunds, Feasenden, Howard, Howe, Morgan, Morrill of Me., Nye, Fatterson of N. H., Poneroy, Ross, Sherman, Stewart, Sunner, Thayer, Williams and Wilson—22.

The CHIEF JUSTICE—On this question the yeas are twenty-two and the mays are twenty-two. The Chief Justice votes in the affirmative; so the motion is agreed to. (Laughter.)

The Chief Justice then vacated the chair, which was immediately resumed by the President pro tem.

Mr. Sherman called up his order suspending for the present the order establishing the ticket system.

After some opposition to the order a motion to adjourn prevailed, and shortly after five o'clock the Senate adjourned.

Janauschek.—Miss Fangy Janauschek, one of the

JANAUSCHEK.-Miss Fanny Janauschek, one of the first of living tragediennes, whose wonderful acting in the most difficult rôtes of the high classic school and musical voice—reflecting every phase of human passion and softening the harshest tones of the German language to the cadences of the softest Italian—have caused her career in this country to be one of unprecedented success, appeared on Wednesday night at the Philadelphia Academy of Music in the character of Mary Stuart. The reception was enthusiastic in the extreme, and her rendering of the rôte satisfied even those who entertained the highest anticipations of her genius. One of the best specimens of art we have seen in this city is a marbie bust of this great actrees, by Mr. Hesse, a New York sculptor. The design and execution are worthy of the subject, and the artist has caught the most lavorable expression of the sparkling features. It is a contrast to some of those specimens of European art which are too often imported here as genuine masterpleces and an encouraging specimen of the progress of American art. in the most difficult rôles of the high classic school

Copeland, Drill Captain of the Metropolitan Police, yesterday commenced the annual inspection of the members of the police force. The sanitary squad and detachments of various other precincts were inspected during the day. The remainder of the force will be inspected during the week. MISCELLANEOUS WASHINGTON NEWS.

sentatives.
The House met at twelve o'clock. A leave of abo was granted to several of the members. Mr. Wash-burne, of Illinois, suggested that it should be the un-derstanding daily that no business should be done on the return of the House to its chamber, unless the Speaker notified the House in the morning that business would be done in the evening. Mr. Niblack suggested that he would move for some badge of honor, a red feather, or something Committee of the Whole, so as to distinguish him in the Senate. The House then proceeded in the usual peachment trial.

The new Tax bill will not contain any provisions altering the existing rates of tax on tobacco, all reports to the contrary notwithstanding. Whatever

The second control of the control of

Senthing Letter of Black to General Gar-field—Seward's Diplomatizing Described. Washington, April 2, 1888. The following letter of Judge Black to General

Garfield, of the House of Representatives, gives his side of the story relative to the Alta Vela (guano island) squabble, which has caused the ex-Attorney General to withdraw from the list of counsel for the President in the impeachment trial. It is particularly severe on Seward, and is well worth perusal:—

larly severe on Seward, and is well worth perusal:—

My Dear Sig—I owe you an explanation of the Alta Vela case, and I will give it to you in as few words as I can.

Alta Vela case, and I will give it to you in as few words as I can.

Alta Vela case, and I will give it to you in as few words as I can.

Alta Vela is a small island or key, half a mile wide and three-quarters of a mile long. It lies about ixtoen miles south of the southermost cape of St. Domingo. Directly between it and St. Domingo is the larger island of Beata, which belongs to and is occupied by Haytl. Alta Vela is destitute of water or vegetation, and was never inhabited or used by any nation or people for any purpose before the discovery of gueno upon it by Captain Kimbali, as hereafter mentioned. It was regarded as useless, and it is useless except for the guano.

You will see from these facts that the island in the hands of Altorney form months.

Is already the vulgar and commonpiace thieving of his protoges by putting a military gloss on it is a complete failure.

Alta Vela is a small island or key, half a mile wide the region of his protoges by putting a military gloss on it is a complete failure.

Alta Vela is a complete failure.

Alta Vela is a complete failure.

Alta Vela is a complete failure.

Alte introduces a letter from me as Attorney General in which I said that a claim of purisdiction in the name of his protoges by putting a military gloss on it is a complete failure.

Alta Vela is a complete failure.

Alte introduces a letter from me as Attorney General in which I said that a claim of purisdiction in the name of his protoges by loved Lyons in the name of his government, should be settled before an American attention and the name of his government, should be settled before an American attention and the name of his government, should be settled before an American attention and the failure.

Corner lating of Remeauals from Plants, which he attention on it is a complete failure.

Alte introduces a legitary well and the failure.

Alt

to the interests of the Dominican lessees did not mean what it said.

I will give you only a specimen or two of the points which sir. Seward had made:—

1. He asserts at one time that we did not ask for resituation and at another that we made no claims for damages. In fact and in truth, we demanded both in the beginning, and never withdrew either. The record shows this.

2. In one place he tries to make out a little for St. Domingo on the ground of military necessity. If citizens of this country were permitted to occupy Alia Vela it might be fortified, and the occupation of it in that way by a hostile Power would be dangerous to St. Domingo. That the United States would need an intermediate point of approach to attack a nation which is not haif as strong as any one ward of Washington city is absurd enough. It is still more so to suppose that Alia Vela would serve such a purpose when you reflect that it lies on the opposite side of Beata, which is already in the hands of a foreign Power. Mr. Seward's effort to dignify the vingar and commonpiace thieving of his protoges by putting a military gloss on it is a complete failure.

3. He introduces a letter from me as Attorney General in which I said that a claim of jurisdiction over Cayo verde, made by Lord Lyons in the name of his government, should be settled before an American after he was in possession with her acquiescence for seven months.

4. He produces legislative acts of St. Domingo in

in the same laws as Alta Vela is, yet Reata is beyond all doubt a Haytien island. The Parliament of England for three centuries habitually called Prance a part of their King's dominion; but I think nobody would say that it was thereby made an appendage of the British Crown.

5. A large part of Mr. Seward's paper consists in an effort to show that Columbus discovered the West India Islands, including Alta Vela, whereby Spalm became the sovereign of it and St. Domingo succeeded to the rights of Spain. To a man of common understanding It is not necessary that a fallacy like this should be exposed. Precisely the same proposition was asserted by Venezuela in the case of the Aves Island; and this government then treated it with contempt. Mr. Marcy and General Cass not only did not make such an argument against the rights of their country, but they repelled it with indignation and put it down as an insult which could not be borne.

1 have selected his strongest points and stated them as fairly as I could in a space so brief. Perhaps diplomacy is a business in which a man is not required to be perfectly honest. It may be that some allowance ought to be made for the tricks of the trade. But surely it is discreditable to the United States that they should have a Secretary whose principles are so loose that he volunteers the influence of his office to defeat justice and employs his time in making false defences for foreigners who have wronged and dishonored the nation. Most respectfully, yours, &c.

Hon. J. A. Garriella, House of Representatives.

BEAUTIFUL GILT GRANT CAMPAIGN BADGES. D which for meatness and cheapness cannot be excelled. Accurs make from \$15 to \$25 per day; profits 500 per cent. Send 25 cents for samples and circular to BLOUD & CO., 525 Wharton street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Wharton street, Philadelphia, Pa.

OATARH AND BRONCHITIS! NEVER CURED! REAsen why!—These fatal parents of consumption are alwars combined with sero-dul. Deafness and opthalmia are
caused by this committation. The deliusive invaluations, trackes,
and souths never cure, as they cannot reach these deep constilitional diseases. Where do we see one case cured by them?
None such exist. The only positive care is Nature's Sovereien Remenials from Plants, which I have discovered
after sixty years of study, and which cradingle these maladies,
and sill scrottle, drapepts, liver, skin, and other cruptive
discases forever. Two circulars three stamps.

WM. R. PRINCE, Norseries, Finsing, New York.

OBENS, BUNIONS, ENLARGHD JOINTS AND ALL
way.

C. SELAT. BARNER, PLANTER, 190 Broadway.

175